UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,142	01/25/2006	Peter Von Zimmermann	07781.0229-00	2084

22852   7590   12/09/2008
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
KANERVO, VIRPI H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/529,142	VON ZIMMERMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VIRPI H. KANERVO	3691	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 17-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 17-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claim 26 is objected to because the preamble appears to be directed to a computer program. The following change would correct the preamble: "A computer readable medium containing computer readable instructions that when executed by a computer performs the steps …" Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 is independent claim, and it is directed to method that is not linked to another statutory class, i.e., it is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Method claim merely having another statutory class in preamble in

absence of another statutory class does not render the claims statutory.

Therefore, claim 1 is rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 2-10 all depend from claim 1. None of the dependent claims 2-7

correct the non-statutory subject matter in claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-10

are also rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
set forth in § 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time
the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-11 and 17-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nip (2003/0212682 A1) in view of Musmanno

(5,940,809).

As to claims 1, 11, and 26, Nip shows producing at least one input data

(Nip: page 2, ¶ 22) and storing the output data with an identification code

(Nip: page 2, ¶ 27).

        Nip does not show the input data record having a structure specific

to a class of business transactions and to one or more business

applications; transforming the at least one input data record into an output

data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code. Musmanno shows the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 11-13) and to one or more business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 25-27); transforming the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 27-28); and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13) by referring to the identification code (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the at least two business applications by referring to the identification code of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 2 and 17, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module. Musmanno shows that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module (Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the producing step being performed using a first program module, the transforming step being performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 3 and 18, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of
to claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the business application is in
the form of a third or further program module. Musmanno shows that the
business application is in the form of a third or further program module
(Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention
to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the business
application being in the form of a third or further program module of
Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing
a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno:
col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 4 and 19, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of
claims 3 and 11. Nip does not show that the second program module is in
a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can
be set by the third program module via an interface. Musmanno shows
that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation
process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module
via an interface (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 16-30). It would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to
have modified the method and the system of Nip by the second program
module being in a form such that the transformation process in the

transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 5 and 20, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 3 and 19. Nip does not show that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the second program module being in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display of

Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing

a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno:

col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 6 and 21, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of

claims 5 and 20. Nip does not show that the selectable data can be

selected by the third program module. Musmanno shows that the

selectable data can be selected by the third program module (Musmanno:

col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified

the method and the system of Nip by the selectable capable of being

selected by the third program module of Musmanno in order to provide an

enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to

select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 7 and 22, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of

claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record is stored

on a transactional basis. Musmanno shows that the output data record is

stored on a transactional basis (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5,

lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of

Nip by the output data record being stored on a transactional basis of

Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing

a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno:

col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 8 and 23, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of

claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record includes,

for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or

more tables. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for a

plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more

tables (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 6-8 and lines 52-55). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record

including, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure

having one or more tables of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced

data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select

assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 9 and 24, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of

claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record includes,

for different journals in accounting, different data areas. Musmanno shows

that the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting,

different data areas (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 56-67; and col. 6, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the

output data record including, for different journals in accounting, different data areas of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 10 and 25, Nip in view of Musmanno shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip does not show that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications. Musmanno shows that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the output data record being designed for access via at least two business applications of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

Asada (5,680,612) discloses document retrieval apparatus retrieving
document data using calculated record identifier.

Church (5,794,234) discloses methods and system for providing electronic
commerce between incompatible data processing systems.

Doughty (7,363,264 B1) discloses processing business transactions using
dynamic database package set switching.

Hu (6,990,466 B1) discloses method and system for integrating core
banking business processes.

Inokuma (5,652,576) discloses switching system and information storing
equipment.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to VIRPI H. KANERVO whose telephone
number is 571-272-9818. The examiner can normally be reached on
Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST. If attempts to reach the
examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,
Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Virpi H. Kanervo

/Alexander Kalinowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691